

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OCTOBER 11, 2006**

- CALL TO ORDER** A meeting of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Board members present were Charles Lapp, Frank DeKort, Randy Toavs, Gordon Cross, Jeff Larsen, Gene Dziza, Kathy Robertson, Kim Fleming and Don Hines. Kirsten Holland, Nicole Lopez-Stickney, and Jeff Harris represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.
- There were approximately 40 people in the audience.
- PUBLIC REVIEW** Jeff Larsen reviewed the public hearing process.
- APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Dekort made a motion seconded by Toavs to approve the minutes from the September 13, 2006 meeting.
- Toavs asked about a motion regarding crosswalks not being in the minutes for FPP-06-36. Staff will check the tape and make changes as necessary.
- The motion passed by quorum.
- PUBLIC COMMENT** None.
- SADDLEHORN PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FPUD-06-02/FPP-06-49** A request by Swan Mountain Partners, LLC, for Preliminary Plat approval of Saddlehorn Subdivision, a one-hundred-sixteen (116) lot mixed-use Major Subdivision and Planned Unit Development on 240 acres. Lots in the subdivision are proposed to have public water and sewer systems. The property is located south of MT Highway 209 in Bigfork.
- STAFF REPORT** Nicole Lopez-Stickney reviewed Staff Report FPUD 06-01 for the Board.
- BOARD QUESTIONS** Lapp asked about staff requiring more right-of-way.
- Lopez-Stickney explained what the applicant is proposing.
- APPLICANT** Doug Averill stated he wanted to walk through this proposal for the Board, looking 30 to 50 years in the planning process, and try to craft the best plan for that purpose. He gave some history of the property and showed a map of Quarter Circle Ranch property, which is the parent corporation for Flathead Lake Lodge. He spoke about the impact to the community and the overall look of the lodge and the community. He stated they created a mountain lodge theme and community, that won't be seen from the highway, and is based on an early pioneer theme which is minimalistic and makes the buildings

and structures subordinate to the land. They will emphasize the natural features and minimize everything. Within the community are all sorts of things being built into it as far as facilities and design to enhance the ability for people to interact. They are trying to avoid "the wealthiest guy building the biggest house". The proposal would be cluster cabin villages around a lodge; a blown up version of Flathead Lake Lodge with amenities scattered around a large area. There would be a marine, the only one on the east side of Flathead Lake. He spoke about cart trails and stated there would be approximately 12 to 15 miles of cart trails that connect all of the area. He spoke of fire reduction with low impact logging and stated they have had a lot of interaction with the Fire Department and Pacific Corp. He commented the project is buffered, as an attempt to minimize impacts on adjoining properties. He stated they were also trying to help them rebuild their water system in the area. He said they wanted to craft something very unique, visionary, and that meets the characteristics of a lodge and of the community. He spoke of the neighborhood plan that was approved in 2005, and stated they created this 800 acre plan (Quarter Circle LA Neighborhood Plan) with a PUD as requested. He stated the early pioneer theme and minimalizing everything brought them to the planning process. He told the Board the names of the professional who worked on this project. He stated that Flathead County does not have planning laws conducive to a unique look. He talked about the existing Flathead Lake Lodge and how the road works in that area with only a 12-foot driving surface. He commented about how that has worked for them. He spoke about the LEED (Leadership and Environmental and Engineering Design) program and how they are one of the first in the area to be a part of this. He also spoke about the Bigfork Water and Sewer District and how they have annexed this property into the district. He spoke of the Fire Department and how they are proposing a station within this proposal which will have security and trained personnel on site, similar to Flathead Lake Lodge. He stated this will not be a closed door type of place. People are welcome to come to the Lodge, sit and visit and have a cup of coffee. He commented that within the project itself, the whole theme is western with an equestrian center. There are places for people to go and do things other than get on a horse, with 8 miles of trails for hiking and biking, bordered on the back side by national forest. It's a land-locked piece of property never used before for hunting or recreational purposes. He showed pictures of architectural designs that would be incorporated into the area, offering smaller cabins so they will utilize the lodge features. He stated they have been working with the Fire Department on the road issues to make sure it will be safe. He also stated the whole project is designed after the national park theme, with view sheds in the community that are set aside for open space. He stated that the best areas are for everybody. He said there would be a homeowner's association to manage road plowing and maintenance. He also said this is being proposed as a family place; they didn't include golf with this. He stated golf is not conducive to a

family environment and would rather have people be out doing things with their families. There would be all sorts of family things built into the community, including teen and child interaction. They are trying to diversify the community with a lot of apartments, dorms, and single bedroom places for people to live in the same community they work in. They have addressed all the construction concerns as best they could and plan to utilize the equestrian area to store equipment and use it as a central receiving area to minimize the amount of coming and going of construction materials and equipment. He also stated they plan to set up a transportation center, which they will call an outpost. It would have a small store, post office, fire station, and would run buses for people much like Glacier Park. He reiterated that the whole community is set up for carts. He spoke of the access into the community and the emergency access as well. They will enhance some of those as they move forward with the project. He introduced Ralph Walton, project manager and gave some of his background.

Walton showed a PowerPoint presentation to the Board, which was meant to be a quick photo tour of the property to give a bit of character to the area Averill talked about.

Mike Fraser, of TD&H, spoke about the neighborhood plan and how it set the framework for this PUD. He stated they want to preserve the character and nature of SAG-5 zoning. He also stated these applications give the community some assurance they will have a master plan community with amenities and features presented before. He spoke about the acreage within the neighborhood plan and how this proposal fits within that acreage. He spoke of the PUD being a 2 part process, this hearing being the first part. Then it will go before the Commissioners for a final decision, and then they would submit a final plat for approval. He spoke of the PUD trade-offs, which included variances for certain amenity packages. He talked about the density bonus and said in exchange for that they are setting aside significant open areas. They are creating a master plan community and a strong public benefit that preserves view sheds for Bigfork and significant open space as well as other community features. He talked about the limits a PUD has for the property and the SAG-5 limitations by comparison. He also spoke about the strict limitations on commercial and residential components. He showed a list of the permitted uses within the PUD and stated the PUD provides for reduced lot sizes and reduces the impact to the area. It also allows, within the design features, limitations on the development of each envelope. He clarified a couple of issues regarding road accesses, and showed what roads would be the primary ingress and egress roads and which would be the emergency access. He spoke about the height limitations and how the Fire Department will have a full fire post station with sprinklers within the facilities. He referenced the staff report and said staff did a good job.

Robertson asked if they were proposing a full fire hydrant system.

Fraser said yes and explained the system they would have.

Fleming asked about the road easements.

Fraser responded and stated their intentions.

Larsen asked about the cul-de-sacs.

Fraser pointed the one in question out on a map.

AGENCIES

None present.

Lopez-Stickney went through letters received.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mahlon Randall, 617 Pommell Drive, spoke about the letter he submitted. He is president of the Ranch Water District and stated their neighborhood has some co-dependency because of elevation. He wanted to bring up three points pertaining to the fact that they need this development in that area. First, the applicants have been good neighbors from day one and have had to work with his subdivision in an attempt not to provide negative impacts to the existing subdivision, and they are helping to upgrade the water system. He spoke of the water problem in their subdivision and stated Averill gave the neighbors the easements to install new lines to improve the system. They are dependant on Saddlehorn PUD because of the elevations for the tank and water pressure for their subdivision. Averill was willing to work with them. The second point he wanted to make was that they are out of time for the funding they anticipated getting. The dilemma is that it must be spent by September 1, 2007 and that means this project must be approved. He spoke about the funding for their water tank and the location, and he stated they could not afford to put upwards of a million dollars into a new system. The third point he wanted to make was dealing with the timeline.

Paul Rana, 15551 Wood Bay Point Road, supports this proposal. He stated this proposal also has the support of US Department of State and US Department of Defense. He spoke about the traditional values this community has to offer other communities worldwide.

Andy Miller, 175 East Many Lakes Drive, stated he is in great support of this project despite the County not having a Growth Policy in place. He commented the land use committee approved this proposal and this PUD has limitations and benefits for everyone involved. He also stated the various concerns people have, it's not the development that makes the people, it's the people that make the development. He believes the developers are very intelligent people who understand the needs with enough respect and integrity to deal with the concerns.

Jan Felt, 108 A Sunrise Terrace in Crestview, is in support of this proposal. She spoke of Flathead Lake Lodge and how it is a great part of the community. She thinks this is a great idea and hopes this and many more like it are built in their area.

Carol Danabough, 14005 Grandview Terrace, had sent a letter to the board and spoke about the mountain resort, a special place that will be an asset to the community. She spoke about the height restrictions and the variances for this proposal. She feels this will be a wonderful impact to the community even if it's a little bit over the height limit. She thinks the old time fire tower would be great. She stated the 50% recreational space is something we don't see often and thinks it's a wonderful plan.

Clarice Ryan, 253 Pine Needle Lane, is very impressed with the planning put into this proposal. She spoke about sometimes being victims of our own regulations and in this case they had a vision that needs to be supported and accommodated and feels we can accommodate for the width of the roads proposed and any other small discrepancies.

Edd Blackler is in favor of this development. He said it is a well thought out and planned with the community's best interest at heart. They are protecting the views that will enhance the community involvement, and he feels there would be quality with this development. He spoke of the topography and said that would absorb any kind of height problem. He stated since there is a timeline involved, he would like it to become a reality.

George Taro, 924 Chapman Hill Road, stated he has enjoyed the view in this area for many years. He spoke about the Averill's and the plan they have proposed. He stated that he was impressed with this project that was intended to be an outreach to Bigfork, a companion community that will work in harmony with Bigfork. It will be an asset to Flathead County and the southeast corner of the county. He thought the emergency exit should be a full loop that would work with the exit and entrance onto Highway 209. He asked the Board to approve this proposal.

Craig Wagner, 1365 LaBrant Road, stated he feels this is well thought out and planned and urged the board to give this a favorable recommendation.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

Harris stated Fraser was right with this being a 2-part plan. He gave the Board their options and stated staff would like to see each portion acted on separately and would like 2 separate actions.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

Fraser clarified the road access issue. He pointed it out on the map. He stated they were serving all of the development area from a single

primary road. He stated the only area they are asking for a variance on is the internal neighborhood roads. He commented it fits with the overall concept of the plan. He said it's hard to separate the PUD and the subdivision applications because they are so intricately tied together. He spoke about the roads in the subdivision and fire suppression.

Robertson asked why Fraser stated there are no variances.

Holland stated they are not variances because it is a PUD, so there is not a formal variance review process like you'd see in a regular subdivision proposal.

Fraser clarified and stated everything is a comprehensive package.

Cross asked about the width of the road and snow plowing.

Fraser stated they are privately maintained roads and there would be a 20 foot width between banks.

Cross wanted clarification on the lodge and rental cabins and the capacities.

Fraser stated that it would be private type, the lodge would not have overnight rentals.

Averill responded about rental cabins and the lodges. He stated that because it is a club environment, it is a way of keeping tighter control and monitoring of the rental pool.

They discussed the rental program and the single family programs being able to utilize that option.

Dziza asked whether the trails, common space, and parks would be open to the public.

Averill stated they are trying to work with Pacific-Corp to see if they could get a public corridor. He stated within the PUD it is all private.

Dziza asked what they are giving in return for the PUD.

Fraser stated they are giving the architectural, a lot of open space and managing that, providing public water and sewer which in a SAG-5 zone is not required, providing an on-site fire station for fire suppression, and they are limiting development to protect the view shed. He said the public would see a very substantial architectural softening to match the environment.

Averill commented about the concerns of mitigating development impacts and spoke about how they are voluntarily setting up a community foundation in which a certain percentage of sales would go

into a community foundation for improvements in Bigfork, such as sidewalks, lighting and street type things. He stated he didn't think this had ever been done before, and it would not only be for original sales, but for future sales as well. He stated that is a big give on their part because that percentage is money they could have put in their pockets as a developer that is going to the community. He stated the amount of dollars they have given up on this project is enormous for character design.

Lapp asked how much employee housing Averill anticipated being there.

Averill stated this project would be about the size of Flathead Lake Lodge or a little bigger, when it's operating and functioning. He stated they employee about 70-100 people.

Lapp asked if they would provide housing for all of the employees.

Averill stated they will house as many as they can onsite. They would like to get them into people's guest houses, dormers, and apartments throughout the project. He said they would like to get as many of those people living onsite; he feels it is good for the community for many reasons.

Lapp asked whether the employee housing was calculated into the commercial aspect of the application.

Fraser responded the employee housing doesn't fit into commercial or single-family residential housing; it is seasonal in nature.

Averill asked if it would be appropriate for a show of hands in support of the project.

Toavs asked if the restaurant would be private or open to the public.

Averill said it would be set up with the flexibility to be a public restaurant.

Toavs asked if the fire station would only be set up for that area or also as a satellite station of the Bigfork Fire Department.

Averill stated it would be a private fire station but they would provide free space for a truck from Bigfork and they would have their own truck to accommodate the terrain.

Averill spoke about how the Growth Policy is putting everything on hold but this project has a timeline to follow and he would like to keep moving because of deadlines. He commented that it is kind of ironic that the Growth Policy would be designed to be a benefit of better

planning and here comes a project they are trying to do the best possible planning in today's world and they are being held up by the Growth Policy.

Larsen asked the Board if they wanted to hear the Preliminary Plat portion of the project before they vote on this proposal.

Fleming stated if the PUD portion is denied the Preliminary Plat portion would not comply with the zoning.

Larsen stated they might get a little bit more information about the project. He asked for a show of hands from the Board to decide whether they heard the subdivision portion of the proposal.

Fleming and Toavs did not raise their hands; they decided to hear the Preliminary Plat portion before making any motions.

**PRELIMINARY
PLAT/
SADDLEHORN
(FPP 06-51)**

A request by Swan Mountain Partners, LLC, for Preliminary Plat approval of Saddlehorn Subdivision, a one-hundred-sixteen (116) lot mixed-use Major Subdivision and Planned Unit Development on 240 acres. Lots in the subdivision are proposed to have public water and sewer systems.

STAFF REPORT

Kirsten Holland reviewed Staff Report FPP-06-51 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

APPLICANT

Walton said "ditto".

Fraser stated staff did a wonderful job. He also stated they do not have a will-serve letter because they have annexed into the district. He stated the first phase of the project will come on line about the same time Bigfork plans on building a new water and sewage treatment plant, so this project should all fit together in terms of capacity. He commented that the language Staff suggests is perfectly acceptable. He spoke of the water tank and the Bigfork Master Plan. He talked about community benefits, this project being one of them. He spoke about the issues with the address and stated they will work with them on road names. They do have a traffic study that indicated no significant impacts. He also spoke about the road issue and that as soon as they have the basic design done on approaches they will work with MDT on those issues as well as the school bus stop. He went through some of the conditions and made some suggestions about how they would like to change a few of them.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

AGENCIES

None present.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Patricia Wagner, 1365 LaBrant Road, stated that subdivision was a nasty word in her opinion. She spoke about other areas in other states and their subdivisions. She urged the Board to take a good hard look at what is going on in other parts of the country and adopt this proposal so it can be the model for other states.

Mahlon Randall, 617 Pommell Drive, spoke about the problems in the Ranch Subdivision. He stated that one of the problems they have had for thirty years is a single entrance with no exit to get across. He stated that would be provided with this proposal with an emergency access for the existing subdivision as well as Saddlehorn.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

Holland asked for clarification on condition # 1 from Fraser.

She also recommended a change for condition #20 (d).

Holland stated, if the Board would agree, she would like to re-word condition #2 and condition #9 so they would not have to make a motion for those.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

None

**MAIN MOTION
FPUD-06-02**

Robertson made a motion seconded by Fleming to adopt Staff Report FPUD-06-02 as findings of fact and recommended approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Cross stated he didn't know how to segregate these two issues, and wanted to be sure what comments would be appropriate for each individual application.

The Board discussed his concern.

Lapp stated he is all for business and the Board shouldn't get too far off track. He stated this is a private business with a few lots for sale. The road issue is also a concern of his. He spoke about the amount of lots that could be placed here, and reiterated his main concern is the road issue.

**MOTION
Condition #4**

Robertson made a motion seconded by Hines to amend condition #4 and change the wording to read that residential buildings or any other building which will be occupied shall not exceed 35 feet. Any other building that exceeds 35 feet shall be fully sprinkled.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the building heights, whether they would be occupied, and fire suppression.

Robertson asked the applicant if any persons would reside in the lodge.

Walton stated they would like to, particularly in the larger buildings, put employee housing in there. But their intent was to do so within the 35 feet. They like the idea of having the flexibility with sprinklers to find other places that may be higher than that.

The Board further discussed the building heights, residential dwellings, and fire suppression.

ROLL CALL
Condition #4

On a roll call vote the motion failed unanimously.

MOTION
Condition #6

Fleming made a motion seconded by DeKort to add condition #6 to read that no roof line would extend above the ridge line.

BOARD
DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the building heights and the ridge line.

Larsen asked the applicant if this condition would be a problem.

Averill spoke about building designs and stated they were trying to hide the buildings, and not obstruct views. He drew a picture of the mountain and showed how the buildings would blend into the landscape.

ROLL CALL
Condition #6

On a roll call vote the motion failed 8-1 with Fleming voting in favor.

MOTION
Condition #3c

Fleming made a motion seconded by Lapp to amend condition #3c to read: Saddlehorn Drive shall consist of a 24-foot paved travel surface and 60-foot road easement. Separated one-way ingress and egress points off Highway 209 shall consist of a minimum 14-foot paved surface and 30-foot easement. Future development will require obtaining a full 60-foot right-of-way on Saddlehorn Drive and expanding the paved driving surface to 24-feet. She would add Saddlehorn Drive west will become a utility easement and remain at 30-feet.

Fleming added that in the event the necessary easements can not be obtained, primary access via Ranch Road will be required.

BOARD
DISCUSSION

Cross asked if they would not have to go to a 60-foot right-of-way until they add additional acreage.

Holland responded that any of the sites located within the 240 acres would also be included in that. The thing is, in order for them to meet that density for the PUD, they have to add additional acreage to develop the sites within the 240 acres that are designated for future development. They cannot exceed their density right now at 96 units, that's the most they can have on the 240 acres, so if they want to develop those internal future development sites they have to add

additional acreage to the site overall.

ROLL CALL
Condition #3c

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

MOTION
Condition #1

Lapp made a motion seconded by Fleming to amend condition #1 to read road surfaces for all internal roads excluding Saddlehorn Drive and its west and south portions shall consist of a 60-foot right-of-way and 20-foot paved surface.

BOARD
DISCUSSION

Fleming supported this motion because of the numerous discussions the Board has had with other people requiring them to have an adequate road width.

Cross stated he feels they are trying to create a state of the art development both environmentally and conditionally. He feels the issue is whether or not the road should be paved. He is comfortable enough with the way the condition reads.

Robertson agreed. The topography is such that a 60-foot right-of-way might not be doable. She stated they want it to look natural and hide all the visual ugliness.

Larsen agreed with Lapp on the 20-foot paved surface, but the 60-foot right-of-way might create some difficulties for them as far as their lot layouts go, and it could really screw up their whole design. He talked about the road widths and the subdivisions regulations, and the ramifications of that for future developments. He has some concerns with a 60-foot right-of-way.

Lapp spoke about his motion and the fact that it could set precedence.

The Board discussed the road width and right-of-ways.

ROLL CALL
Condition #1

On a roll call vote the motion failed 5-4 with Robertson, Hines, Dziza, Cross and DeKort dissenting.

MOTION
Condition #1

Lapp made a motion seconded by Fleming to amend condition #1 to read road surfaces for all internal roads excluding Saddlehorn Drive and its west and south portions shall consist of a 40-foot right-of-way with 20-foot paved driving surface.

BOARD
DISCUSSION

None.

ROLL CALL
Condition #1

On a roll call vote the motion passed 6-3 with Dziza, Dekort and Robertson dissenting.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Dziza asked staff what makes this application different than another PUD or zone change since the County is not processing zoning applications.

Harris clarified this for the Board. He commented it is for 2 reasons. One is the timing of when the application was submitted, and the second issue is because the Growth Policy not being completed or approved. He commented that it is staffs opinion as well as the County Attorney that zoning is frozen with the exception of hardship variances and conditional use permits, which we can do with the existing zoning without having to make any modifications. He stated a PUD is permanent zoning. At the approval of the final PUD plan, the Commissioners will draft a resolution adopting the PUD as the zoning district at that time. We can't do that until the Growth Policy is in place. He stated the applicant is waiving the 80 day process time for the preliminary plat. There is no process time for the PUD portion, but the applicant didn't want the PUD portion to be held hostage to the timing of the subdivision plat. It was decided that we would proceed with this application while the Growth Policy was being done for preliminary approval, and then get to the Commissioners after the Growth Policy is adopted for final approval.

Dziza asked if there were any other PUD applications to process.

Harris stated there were none.

Larsen commented he doesn't understand how the Planning Board could make a recommendation based on the legal aspect. He knows the Commissioners have the final decision, but he feels the Planning Board has to review applications based on the legality.

Harris responded stating the zoning district is not created until the final resolution.

Larsen and Harris discussed the issue further.

Sean Frampton, and attorney representing Saddlehorn, encouraged the Board to proceed with their recommendation as they have done extensive research on the difference between the last time the Counties and Cities failed to adopt their Growth Policy.

He spoke about legislation and what they did following the current law. He stated that what they did essentially was make everything optional. The County does not have to do a Growth Policy, they don't have to do it for an entire area.

In his opinion they can proceed, and the zoning does not freeze. He encouraged the board to proceed and then when it goes to the Commissioners the applicants deal with them to come up with a solution that makes this process go forward. If the law does come to a stop, what it is saying is you can not change zoning. That zoning

change only happens on final plat approval, which we are not at this is still preliminary.

**MOTION
Condition #6**

Cross made a motion seconded by Dziza to add condition #6 to read the final approval in creation of the PUD overlay zoning district will not occur until such time as Flathead County has adopted a Growth Policy consistent with MCA 76-1-6013.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Lapp read a letter form the County Attorney's Office stating that the County can not revise zoning without a Growth Policy nor do they allow the County to pre-approve zoning revisions to take effect upon the adoption of the Growth Policy.

The Board discussed the letter.

**ROLL CALL
Condition #6**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 8-1 with Fleming dissenting.

**ROLL CALL
Condition #4**

Toavs made a motion seconded by Lapp to amend condition #4 to add that no public occupancy or living of any kind above the second story of the lodge or equestrian center is permitted.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL
Condition #4**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 8-1 with Fleming dissenting.

**MAIN MOTION
ROLL CALL
FPUD-06-02**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 8-1 with Larsen dissenting.

**MAIN MOTION
FPP-06-51**

Robertson made a motion seconded by Hines to adopt Staff Report FPP-06-51 as findings of fact and recommended approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Holland read through the conditions and finding of fact she had amended during the presentation.

**MOTION
Condition #3**

Lapp made a motion seconded by Hines to amend condition #3 to read road surfaces for all other internal roads shall consist of a 40-foot right-of-way and 20-foot paved driving surface.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL
Condition #3**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Lapp commented on the road issue.

**MOTION
Condition #24**

Lapp made a motion seconded by Fleming to add condition #24 to read Ranch Road shall be constructed to have a 24-foot paved travel surface from the intersection of Barn Dance Drive to Montana 35 as typical 24-foot road section on the preliminary plat map indicates.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL
Condition #24**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 8-1 with Robertson dissenting.

**MOTION
Finding of Fact
#8**

Cross made a motion seconded by Robertson to add Finding of Fact #8 to read the subdivision is in a high fire hazard area and there are plans for considerable public occupancy. However, several state of the art fire reduction practices have been performed and plans call for the installation of a fire hydrant system and fire sprinkling in public buildings.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL
Finding of Fact
#8**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Fleming made a comment about the traffic study and how the site would be improved by cutting down the bushes along the side of the road.

Larsen commented that he will vote no due to the underlying legal basis. He stated they had done a nice job and he likes the subdivision.

**MAIN MOTION
ROLL CALL
FPP-06-51**

On a roll call vote the motion passed 8-1 with Larsen dissenting.

OLD BUSINESS

Cross commented on the Community Character chapter of the Growth Policy.

NEW BUSINESS

Harris let the board know what was coming up at their next several meetings.

Robertson stated she would not be at the November 15, 2006 meeting.

Fleming stated she would be gone right up until the next Planning Board meeting, which meant she would not be at the Growth Policy meetings for the rest of October. She stated she would email Larsen with her comments on the text.

Dekort stated he had spoken with Grieve and asked for the chapters in the Growth Policy that the Planning Board had updated to be printed and handed out to the Board members.

Harris stated they would hand those out at the next Growth Policy meeting, as well as the Natural Resource Document.

Dziza inquired about the report from our office regarding the recommendations by staff, the Planning Board, and the Commissioners.

Harris stated that staff thought it was a good idea, and is currently inputting that information in our database. We will have all of fiscal year 2006, and then will go month to month, or quarterly for fiscal year 2007. We need a little bit more time due to the fact we had to create the database.

Lapp asked for clarification whether or not the Planning Office charged a fee for the Saddlehorn PUD.

Harris stated that we had.

Lapp continued to comment about charging fees for Neighborhood Plans.

Harris stated that the Planning Office has no fee base schedule for Neighborhood Plans.

Lapp stated that that the Riverdale Group had been charged.

Harris stated that was submitted before he started working in the Planning Office, and in his opinion we should not be charging for Neighborhood Plans.

Larsen asked if we would charge Riverdale now.

Harris said absolutely not, he doesn't believe we should be charging for the preparation of county plans. We should be assisting where we can, based on available staff.

Larsen asked if the Planning Office would refund Riverdale's money.

Harris stated we could not do that, it took place before he came on board. He commented it was unfortunate that they have paid a great deal of money and staff continues to assist in re-writing their plan, processing it, and doing the mapping the project at no cost.

Larsen asked about a gravel pit amendment that the Board asked Staff to look into. He wanted to know when they would get something on that.

Harris state staff would obviously not do any gravel pit amendments until after the Growth Policy is adopted because that is a text change to the zoning regulations. He stated that when we do that one, staff is going to fix the contradiction between DEQ regulations and Flathead County Regulations. Right now everything is on hold.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 p.m. on a motion by Hines seconded by Robertson. The next meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on October 18, 2006.

Jeff Larsen, President

Mary Sevier, Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED/CORRECTED: 11/15/06